

Message

---

**From:** LEE, LILY [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=D6085A744F9347E6836C54C0E85B97B2-LLEE06]  
**Sent:** 10/2/2017 10:00:30 PM  
**To:** Brooks, George P CIV [george.brooks@navy.mil]  
**CC:** Henderson, Kim/SDO [Kimberly.Henderson@CH2M.com]; juanita.bacey@dtsc.ca.gov  
**Subject:** Suggested agenda items for technical team conference call  
**Attachments:** Data Evaluation Documentation and Findings - EPA Comments 6-9-2017.pdf

Dear Pat and Kim,

Thank you for sending the Parcel G & B reports. We are reviewing them. In the mean time, I wanted to suggest the following potential topics for the upcoming 10/3 and/or 10/17 calls:

Soil forms report:

- Let's discuss the types of findings that led you to conclusions about which category a survey unit should go to, i.e., resampling vs. reanalyze archived samples vs. no further action.
- It would also help expedite reviews to get less blurry versions of figures.
- Please see attached comments we sent in June regarding format of information presented in forms. It would expedite our reviews to have this type of format in displays.
- See below previous discussion about showing data quality concerns.

Buildings

- As you saw from the email from CDPH last week, we want to understand better what the Navy intends. For example, when you said you want to reclassify survey units based on static measurements. Will you do scans to help select biased locations for static measurements? What testing will be done for loose contamination?
- EPA will not at this time request further searching for instances of duplication. However, any findings regarding potential falsification in buildings found recently or in the future should be considered in the determination of future locations for scanning and samplings as potential indications of contamination present.

Thanks!

- Lily

In my September 26, 2017, email to Pat I wrote this:

- "We talked a few weeks ago about the Navy possibly changing the Parcel B map to show only areas where specifically potential evidence of falsification had been observed. I understand that your 3<sup>rd</sup> party expert consultants also found data quality problems that may or may not be signs of falsification. You had agreed that for the maps in the upcoming reports that you would show in a different color survey units where data quality concerns have been found. Please add these to the next version of these maps.
- Regarding data quality, as I said at the 9/12 meeting, I know that data quality was not the task assigned to your contract team. However, to the extent that the Navy will propose consideration of use of Tetra Tech previously collected data for any future decisions, I am interested to learn more about the data quality issues that your consultants found. I appreciated that Craig gave an informal listing off the top of his head of data quality observations for buildings. I'd like to hear a more complete list of data quality observations for both buildings and soil from the 3<sup>rd</sup> party independent consultants. Maybe the Oct. 3 regular call would be a good time to hear these. Or you could email out a list.
- We talked several weeks ago about the request from Greenaction for records from the technical meetings, including agendas, participants lists, and minutes."

Lily Lee

Cleanup Project Manager  
Superfund Division  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9  
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-8-3)  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Tel: 415-947-4187, Fax: 415-947-3518  
For information on Superfund in general: [www.epa.gov/region9/superfund](http://www.epa.gov/region9/superfund)  
For information on Hunters Point Naval Shipyard: [www.epa.gov/superfund/hunterspoint](http://www.epa.gov/superfund/hunterspoint)